

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on December 4, 2006.

Claim 15 is amended, no claims are cancelled, or added; as a result, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-15, 17, and 18 remain pending in this application.

Applicant further notes that a member of the same patent application family as the present application, specifically, serial no. 11/458,976, has published as 20060290438A1.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 was objected to for informalities. Claim 15 has been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6, 7-9, 11, 12, 13-15, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking adequate description or enablement.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the limitation of a dielectric thickness over the microstrip line being greater than the dielectric thickness in at least one other area of the substrate is new matter. The previous claims recited that the thickness of the dielectric coating over the microstrip line was greater than the average thickness of the dielectric material. Because the thickness over the microstrip line was greater than average, it inherently therefore must have been greater than the thickness over at least one other area of the substrate.

This limitation is also supported by examples presented in the specification and drawings, such as Figure 6, which illustrates a dielectric coating 605 placed over the microstrip lines 603 and 604, but not over adjacent portions of the substrate 601. Note specifically that the coating 605 tapers down to having no thickness over the substrate at both the right and left sides of the drawing of Figure 6.

Claim 2 was amended to simply restate the limitations of the claim as it previously stood, such that the dielectric constant of the coating varies from the dielectric constant of free space in the same direction as the dielectric constant of the printed circuit board.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of Bruns, Maschotta and Anderson (all of record) in view of Suzuki (EP 0382558).

Claims 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over one of Bruns, Maschotta and Anderson in view of Suzuki.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maschotta in view of Suzuki.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Forbes et al. (of record).

Claims 7-9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of Bruns, Maschotta and Anderson in view of Suzuki and Forbes et al.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maschotta or Anderson in view of Suzuki and Forbes et al.

Claim 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above as applied to claim 13 and further in view of Adachi (of record).

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruns, Maschotta or Anderson in view of Suzuki and Adachi.

Each of these rejections relies on Suzuki to anticipate the recited claim element of a dielectric coating thickness over a microstrip line that is greater than a thickness of the coating material in at least one other area of the substrate.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Suzuki shows or describes such a limitation. Visual examination of Figure 1 suggests that the conformal coating is approximately the same thickness across all portions, and use of a ruler confirms that the illustrated coating as drawn is consistently just over two millimeters in thickness both over the stripline and in all other areas of the substrate.

Suzuki's specification further describes the coating layer as being formed from porous PTFE that is 0.1mm thick across all portions of the substrate for both top coating 10U and the bottom coating 10L (*see*, col. 4, ln. 17-21).

In summary, Suzuki and the other cited references all fail to show, individually or when combined, an assembly having a dielectric coating thickness over a microstrip line on a substrate that is greater than a thickness of the coating material in at least one other area of the substrate. Reexamination and allowance pending claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-15, 17, and 18 is therefore respectfully requested.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 349-9581 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

ROY GREEFF

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 349-9581

Date

Mar. 5 07

By



John M. Dahl

Reg. No. 44,639

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 5 day of March 2007.

Name

Kate Gaudio

Signature

Late Go